



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,612	08/15/2001	Ian C. Williams	008A.0001.U1(US)	1604
29683	7590	10/12/2005	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			POPHAM, JEFFREY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/930,612

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS, IAN C.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,102-119,125-161,175-178 and 180-186 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,102-119,125-161,175-178 and 180-186 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

P

Remarks

Claims 1, 102-119, 125-161, 175-178, and 180-186 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 18-20, filed 8/1/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 102-119, 125-161, 175-178, and 180-182 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made with Raanan in view of Piccioni (U.S. Patent 6,842,774), Tanaka (U.S. Patent 5,539,909), Willmann (U.S. Patent 5,521,923), RFC791 ("Internet Protocol, DARPA Internet Program Protocol Specification", 9/1981, obtained from <http://rfc.net/rfc791.html>), and OSTA (OSTA, "The Benefits of Writable Optical Storage", 2/25/1999, pp. 1-4, obtained from <http://web.archive.org/web/20000510215932/www.osta.org/html/benefits.html>).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2137

2. Claims 1, 102-105, 108, 109, 111, 125, 127, 132-135, 137-144, 148, 149, 151, 158, 175-177, 180, 181, 183, and 186 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raanan (U.S. Patent 6,311,278).

Regarding Claim 1,

Raanan discloses a data processing system, comprising:

A first processing resource (gateway/filter) in the form of a web server coupleable to an open communications network (Column 5, lines 10-29); and

A second processing resource (server) in the form of a back end server coupleable to the first processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29);

The first processing resource and the second processing resource being configured to establish a communications relationship between them through a non-network connected communications channel, whereby the second processing resource is restricted to implementing an instruction communicated from the first processing resource which only performs a predetermined allowable operation, thereby inhibiting compromise of the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 125,

Claim 125 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 135,

Claim 135 is an apparatus claim that is broader than system claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 140,

Claim 140 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 175,

Claim 175 is a carrier medium claim that corresponds to system claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 180,

Claim 180 is a carrier medium claim that corresponds to system claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 102,

Raanan discloses that the first processing resource is configured to transmit the instruction to the second processing resource for the instruction satisfying a predetermined criterion (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 141,

Claim 141 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 102 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 176,

Claim 176 is a carrier medium claim that corresponds to system claim 102 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 181,

Claim 181 is a carrier medium claim that corresponds to system claim 102 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 103,

Raanan discloses that the first processing resource is configured to transmit the instruction to the second processing resource and where the second processing resource is configured to execute the instruction for the instruction satisfying a predetermined criterion (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 142,

Claim 142 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 103 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 177,

Claim 177 is a carrier medium claim that corresponds to system claim 103 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 104,

Raanan discloses the predetermined criterion comprising the instruction being included in a predefined set of allowable instructions for the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 143,

Claim 143 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 104 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 105,

Raanan discloses the predetermined criterion comprising the instruction being identified as an allowable instruction for the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 144,

Claim 144 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 105 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 108,

Raanan discloses the instruction comprising a computer program procedure name (Column 5, lines 10-29; and Column 6, lines 1-6).

Regarding Claim 132,

Claim 132 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 108 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 137,

Claim 137 is an apparatus claim that is broader than system claim 108 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 148,

Claim 148 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 108 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 109,

Raanan discloses the second processing resource configured to provide a reply message to the first processing resource responsive to an instruction satisfying the predetermined criterion (Column 4, lines 46-64).

Regarding Claim 149,

Claim 149 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 109 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 111,

Raanan discloses the instruction being comprised in a message for transmission to the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 127,

Claim 127 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 111 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 151,

Claim 151 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 111 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 133,

Raanan discloses the predetermined criterion comprising the instruction or the computer program procedure being included in a predefined set of allowable instructions or computer program procedures for the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 138,

Claim 138 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 133 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 134,

Raanan discloses the predetermined criterion comprising the instruction or the computer program procedure being identified as an allowable instruction or computer program procedure for the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 10-29).

Regarding Claim 139,

Claim 139 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 134 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 158,

Raanan discloses the first processing resource deriving sensitive information from a communication, and including the sensitive information in the message (Column 1, lines 54-64; and Column 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding Claim 183,

Raanan discloses that the system is configured to operate in a command mode for transmitting commands from the second processing resource to the first processing resource (Column 4, line 65 to Column 5, line 10). This is the case where the protocol database in the first processing resource is not static through sessions, and is modified dynamically by the second processing resource.

Regarding Claim 186,

Claim 186 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 183 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 106, 136, and 145 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raanan in view of Piccioni (U.S. Patent 6,842,774).

Regarding Claim 106,

Raanan discloses that all messages from the second processing resource will pass through the first processing resource (Column 4, lines 46-64), but does not disclose the second processing resource being configured to transmit an instruction fail message responsive to the second processing resource determining the instruction failing to satisfy the predetermined criterion.

Piccioni, however, discloses the second processing resource being configured to transmit an instruction fail message responsive to the second processing resource determining the instruction failing to satisfy the predetermined criterion (Column 6, lines 8-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the notification system of Piccioni into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow the second processing resource to return generalized information to parties that are not allowed full access to

the information, thus protecting the secure information from parties which do not have the correct access permissions.

Regarding Claim 136,

Claim 136 is an apparatus claim that is broader than system claim 106 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 145,

Claim 145 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 106 and is rejected for the same reasons.

4. Claims 107, 146, and 147 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raanan in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent 5,539,909).

Regarding Claim 107,

Raanan discloses that the second processing resource determines which instructions are to be included in the database of allowable functionality (Column 4, lines 46-64), but does not disclose that the second processing resource determines this by using a database located at the second processing resource.

Tanaka, however, discloses that the second processing resource comprises a database of executable instructions defining predetermined allowable functionality of the second processing resource (Column 5, lines 3-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the RPC system of Tanaka into

the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow the server to change pointers, parameters, etc. in the exact calling procedure, while allowing the client to use a persistent message to call that same procedure, without needing to know the specifics of how the procedure will be formatted at the second processing resource.

Regarding Claim 146,

Claim 146 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 107 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 147,

Raanan as modified by Tanaka disclose the method of claim 146, in addition, Tanaka discloses the second processing resource comparing the instruction with the database of executable instructions for determining whether the instruction is an allowable instruction (Column 7, lines 14-32).

5. Claims 110, 112-119, 126, 128-131, 150, 152-157, and 159 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raanan in view of Willmann (U.S. Patent 5,521,923).

Regarding Claim 110,

Raanan does not disclose the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the instruction in a queue prior to transmission to the second processing resource.

Willmann, however, discloses the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the instruction in a queue prior to transmission to the second processing resource (Column 4, lines 26-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 126,

Claim 126 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 110 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 150,

Claim 150 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 110 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 112,

Raanan does not disclose the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the message in a queue prior to transmission to the second processing resource.

Willmann, however discloses the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the message in a queue prior to transmission to the second processing resource (Column 4, lines

26-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 152,

Claim 152 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 112 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 113,

Raanan discloses that the message includes an instruction type (Column 5, lines 10-29; and Column 6, lines 1-6), but does not disclose that the first processing resource is configured to include in the message an action code indicative of the instruction type.

Willmann, however, discloses that the message includes an instruction type and the first processing resource is configured to include in the message an action code indicative of the instruction type (Column 3, line 65 to Column 4, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced,

just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 128,

Claim 128 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 113 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 153,

Claim 153 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 113 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 114,

Raanan discloses that the message includes an instruction type (Column 5, lines 10-29; and Column 6, lines 1-6), but does not disclose the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the message prior to transmission to the second processing resource, the first processing resource being further configured to include in the message an action code indicative of the instruction type, and the first processing resource configured to store the message in accordance with a priority assigned to the action code.

Willmann, however, discloses the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the message prior to transmission to the second processing resource (Column 4, lines 26-36), the first processing resource being further configured to include in the message an action code indicative of the instruction type, and the first

processing resource configured to store the message in accordance with a priority assigned to the action code (Column 3, line 65 to Column 4, line 4; and Column 4, line 48 to Column 5, line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 129,

Claim 129 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 114 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 154,

Claim 154 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 114 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 115,

Raanan does not disclose the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the message prior to transmission to the second processing resource, the first processing resource configured to store messages in accordance with their chronological order

Willmann, however, discloses the first processing resource comprising a storage medium configured to store the message prior to

transmission to the second processing resource, the first processing resource configured to store messages in accordance with their chronological order (Column 4, lines 9-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 130,

Claim 130 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to system claim 115 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 155,

Claim 155 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 115 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 116,

Raanan as modified by Willmann disclose the system of Claim 114, in addition, Willmann discloses the first processing resource being configured to select a stored message for transmission to the second processing resource in accordance with a priority determined by the action code of the message (Column 6, line 66 to Column 7, line 6).

Regarding Claim 156,

Claim 156 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 116 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 117,

Raanan discloses the first processing resource configured to transmit the instruction or a message including the instruction responsive to receiving a communication comprising sensitive information (Column 1, lines 54-64; and Column 2, lines 40-42), but does not disclose discarding the sensitive information from the first processing resource.

Willmann, however, discloses discarding the sensitive information from the first processing resource (Column 4, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 118,

Raanan as modified by Willmann discloses the system of claim 117, in addition, Raanan discloses the message representing sensitive information derived from the communication (Column 1, lines 54-64; and Column 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding Claim 119,

Raanan as modified by Willmann discloses the system of claim 117, in addition, Willmann discloses that the sensitive information is discarded in response to transmission of the message comprising sensitive information to the second processing resource (Column 4, lines 37-44).

Regarding Claim 131,

Raanan discloses the first processing resource being configured to transmit the instruction or message responsive to receiving the communication comprising sensitive information (Column 1, lines 54-64; and Column 2, lines 40-42), but does not disclose removing at least that part of the communication comprising sensitive information from the first processing resource.

Willmann, however, discloses removing at least that part of the communication comprising sensitive information from the first processing resource (Column 4, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 157,

Raanan discloses the first processing resource transmitting the instruction or message in response to receiving a communication comprising sensitive information (Column 1, lines 54-64; and Column 2, lines 40-42), but does not disclose discarding the sensitive information from the first processing resource.

Willmann, however, discloses discarding the sensitive information from the first processing resource (Column 4, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

Regarding Claim 159,

Raanan does not disclose the first processing resource discarding the sensitive information in response to a transmission of the message comprising the sensitive information to the second processing resource.

Willmann, however, discloses the first processing resource discarding the sensitive information in response to a transmission of the message comprising the sensitive information to the second processing resource (Column 4, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate

the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

6. Claims 160, 161, 184, and 185 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raanan in view of Willmann, further in view of RFC791 ("Internet Protocol, DARPA Internet Program Protocol Specification", 9/1981, obtained from <http://rfc.net/rfc791.html>).

Regarding Claim 160,

Raanan does not disclose the first processing resource discarding the sensitive information within a predetermined time period.

Willmann, however, discloses the first processing resource discarding the sensitive information (Column 4, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the memory storage system of Willmann into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to allow those messages of high priority to be serviced in a FIFO manner first, while the messages of lower priority will be serviced, just less often, since they aren't of as great importance as the higher priority messages.

RFC791, however, discloses the first processing resource discarding the sensitive information within a predetermined time period (Page 30, Time to Live section, Paragraph 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the timer system of RFC791 into the protocol filtering system of Raanan as modified by Willmann in order to allow undeliverable packets to be discarded after a preset time limit, thus clearing the queue for deliverable packets.

Regarding Claim 161,

Raanan as modified by Willmann and RFC791 disclose the method of claim 160, in addition, RFC791 discloses that the time period is one of the following: 91) less than 2 minutes from receipt of the communication, (2) less than 1 minute from receipt of the communication, or (3) the shortest time possible from receipt of the communication (Pages 27-28, An Example Reassembly Procedure section, Paragraph 4).

Regarding Claim 184,

Raanan as modified by Willmann does not disclose the first processing resource being configured to discard the sensitive information within a predetermined time period.

RFC791, however, discloses the first processing resource being configured to discard the sensitive information within a predetermined time period (Page 30, Time to Live section, Paragraph 1). It would have been

Art Unit: 2137

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the timer system of RFC791 into the protocol filtering system of Raanan as modified by Willmann in order to allow undeliverable packets to be discarded after a preset time limit, thus clearing the queue for deliverable packets.

Regarding Claim 185,

Raanan as modified by Willmann and RFC791 disclose the system of claim 184, in addition, RFC791 discloses that the time period is one of the following: (1) less than two minutes from receipt of the communication or (2) the shortest possible time from receipt of the communication (Pages 27-28, An Example Reassembly Procedure section, Paragraph 4).

7. Claims 178 and 182 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raanan in view of OSTA (OSTA, "The Benefits of Writable Optical Storage", 2/25/1999, pp. 1-4, obtained from <http://web.archive.org/web/20000510215932/www.osta.org/html/benefits.html>).

Regarding Claim 178,

Raanan does not disclose that the carrier medium comprises at least one of the following: a solid-state memory; a magnetic tape memory medium; a magnetic disc; and an optical storage medium.

OSTA, however, discloses that the carrier medium comprises at least one of the following: a solid-state memory; a magnetic tape memory

medium; a magnetic disc; and an optical storage medium (Pages 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the optical storage of OSTA into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to store the machine readable instructions on a medium that is very durable, has a long lifetime, and can store a lot of data.

Regarding Claim 182,

Raanan does not disclose that the carrier medium comprises at least one of the following: a solid-state memory; a magnetic tape memory medium; a magnetic disc; and an optical storage medium.

OSTA, however, discloses that the carrier medium comprises at least one of the following: a solid-state memory; a magnetic tape memory medium; a magnetic disc; and an optical storage medium (Pages 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the optical storage of OSTA into the protocol filtering system of Raanan in order to store the machine readable instructions on a medium that is very durable, has a long lifetime, and can store a lot of data.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).